SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

WASHINGTON, D.C.

Rt.Rev.Dr.Edward Wayland *

*

against * No. 82-5488

*

Internal Revenue Service et al *

SUPPLEMENT ADDITION

SUMMARY

"IGNORANCE OF THE LAW IS NO EXCUSE"

was mis-translated by an overeager, zealous (and quite probably corrupt mercenary) from:

"Ignorantia juris quod quisque tenetur scire, neminem excusat"

which, properly translated means:

"IGNORANCE OF THE RIGHTS WHICH EVERY ONE IS BOUND TO KNOW, EXCUSES NO MAN."

and which is entirely different. The first is a violation of the Constitution on its face and in its application; while the second acknowledges that it is RIGHTS, not "law" which is governing

Thus, in an educational system that erroneously..and deliberately ..teaches that RIGHTS are a grant from government; and refuses to teach the the government abides, not by the Constitution, but by hidden, secret laws that take years for "specialists" to fathom... "ignorance of the law..." is not valid, nor binding upon the Sovereign Citizen Sovereign Immunity (Preamble;Amend.9,10;Declaration of Independence); and the government is REQUIRED to assume that the Grievance of the Citizen is correct, adjudicable, and must supply Justice on demand; the Burden-of-Proof being upon the government, not upon the Citizen.

And...the government has absolutely, totally Failed-to-Prove. Thus, The Citizen's Grievances stand Admitted, Admitted/Averred as TRUE; and remain Prima Facie Evidence for all time.

Appellant, Rt.Rev.Dr.Edward Wayland, as Christian Minister, in total IMMUNITY as under the Common Law prior to Constitution of U.S., herein states that he has demanded from government, branches

of government, quasi-governments, that each and all ABIDE by their contract with him: the U.S.Constitution; and has NEVER admitted to any betrayal of that contract.

Appellant, Rt.Rev.Dr.Edward Wayland, as Sovereign Citizen Sovereign Immunity has NOT ever waived Equal Protection, Equal Application as a substantive Common Law (Christian) of American Jurisprudence, and DUE PROCESS OF LAW in this and all associated, ancillary, presedent and subsequent actions and matters, events and process which, as Appellant alone shall determine, is related hereto.

Appellant, Rt.Rev.Dr.Edward Wayland, has pleaded the issues of the Constitution of the U.S. (which Defendant has ignored), and all Law and fact at the Administrative levl, executive and judiciary courts. Bivins v 6 U.S.Scalawage 403 US 388; Owens v City of Independence, 100 S.Ct.1398

Appellant has been FORCED against his will, against his better judgment, against his rights and interests, against and in violation of his intent and to his damage and detriment--into use of all alleged "negotiable instruments" (federal reserve notes whichare unconstitutional even at the federal level) by device and operation of law authorizing current monopoly nonspecie banking practices. (12 U.S.C.; 31 U.S.C.).
(It would be unconscionable to hold one to a contract..and law implied therein..to which he is not a voluntary party thereto; Swanson v Fuline, 248 F.Supp.364,res judicata)

Appellant, Rt.Rev.Dr.Edward Wayland, has NEVER voluntarily, knowingly, intentionally submitted to the jurisdiction of the Law Merchant, nor "Federal Law Merchant", nor any like body of law or fact, nor to International Law, Treaties, secret-hidden laws, rules regulations and the like, nor to Administrative-Executive-or Judiciary-made Law,etc.etc.; nor subscribed to same in any manner: and has, in the past, at the Administrative and Judicial levels, and in the present REPUDIATE, REJECT, and in all other ways DENY the same and like or related jurisdiction/authority over Appellant.

These denials, Disclaimers, Declarations, And REVOCATION has been made at the Administrative levels of the I.R.S., Social Security Administration, the numerous state and federal courts; and, demand has been made for PROOF of Jurisdiction/Authority. Failing-to-Prove, Appellees has Admitted,Admitted/Averred as TRUE to want of Jurisdiction.

NOTICE OF TRESPASS was filed with Appellee, thereby; and ALL actions therefrom, with out jurisdiction/authority, are TRESPASS. Thus, APPELLEE, in fiking LIEN upon Church is in violation of the Sovereign Citizen Sovereign Immunity NOTICE OF TRESPASS, as well.

Thus, Appellee has not only ACCEPTED all Appellant's Denials, Disclaimers, Declarations as to total want of jurisdiction/authority, but has FAILED TO PROVE any (as required by Common Law Public-Wrong). Thus, the lower courts, "executive"and "judiciary" have TRESPASSED against Appellant's RIGHTS; and have failed-to-prove that the Law Merchant, etc. are "judicially" or "quasi-judicially" valid and binding.

(Burden-of-Proof: 5 U.S.C. 559(2);556(d);
Concrete Materials Co. v FTC 189 F2d 359;
Maine v Thiboutot 100 S.Ct. 2502

NOTICE OF FELONY was filed against Appellee (I.R.S.); and which Appellee refused to present to the Grand Jury of Sovereign Citizen Sovereign Immunity; thereby establishing collusion/conspiracy, etc. And, having FAILED to PROTECT, has attacked the Sovereignty of the Appellant, Rt.Rev.Dr.Edward Wayland, Christian Minister, thereby attacking GOD, and establishing satan as dominant and governing.

The decisions (above) hold that in all cases, due to its limited jurisdiction in Federal "courts" (administrative, executive, judiciary) must allege and prove jurisdiction. (U.S.Constitution, or any part thereof is JURISDICTIONAL);
U.S.Constitution. Interpretation and Analysis
U.S.Congress: Jayson/Small (1969::1971) re:
McCulloch v Md. 43 US 316, etc. res judicata
5 U.S.C. 556(d), 559(2)
Concrete Materials Co. v BTC; U.S. v Albrecht 271 US 1

A study of instant case PROVES that in both Civil and Criminal aspects, there is a glaring absence of affirmative substantive allegation and proof of I.R.S. "primary" or administrative Jurisdiction; nor any proofs that Appellant has granted permission/consent for that abominable actions taken against him and his CHURCH. This is VITAL. For, without proof of Jurisdiction/Authority...ALL actions, inactions by Appellee's I.R.S. is illegal, unlawful, unConstitutional. Res Judicataa

When the Appellee actually or constructively (erroneously) claims and or exercises jurisdiction over one otherwise EXEMPT/IMMUNE, it is presumed that the exemption/immunity has been waived, abondoned or overcome unless IMMUNITY has been squarely raised and Jurisdiction objected to (federal jurisdiction can NOT be assumed. It must be proven by Appellee).

And, at NO time did Appellant, Rt.Rev.Dr.Edward Wayland surrender his Exemptions, Immunities, Privileges. NOR can Appellee prove he has done so. For, Appellant, Rt.Rev.Dr.Edward Wayland has HUNDREDS of Prima Facie Evidence that he has denied, disclaimed, declared and REVOKED.

For, there is always a presumption AGAINST federal jurisdiction
Lehigh Mining v Kelly 16 S.Ct. 307
Associates v Ins. Co. 446 F2d 1187

and where statute is not clear as to a substantive issue, the Tax issue (or harassment) is to be construed in favor of the vicatim.
Spreckles Sugar v McClain 192 US 397
Connally v GEC 269 US 385
U.S. v Cohen 255 US 81
U.S. v Reese 92 US 214
U.S. v Kirby 7 Wall 482, etc. res judicata

Appellant, Rt.Rev.Dr.Edward Wayland, has continuously charged Appellee's I.R.S. with FRAUD, want of Jurisdiction/Authority, Felony, etc.etc.etc. And has charged the lower courts with Subornation/Collusion/Conspiracy/ wand of jurisdiction/authority to violate Constitutional Rights,etc.etc. res judicata.

For, once JURISDICTION is challanged, such jurisdiction can not be assumed. It must be proven by Appellee, I.R.S., lower courts.
Maine v Thiboutot 100 S.Ct. 2502.

Furthermore, it is necessary for opposing litigant to state his cause and defense against all matters pleaded or judicially

noticed--or right to that defense is waived.
Common Law Pleadings Koffler/Reppy:140

Appellee has failed to defend...for said Appellee has NO defense and has Admitted, Admitted/Averred all facts ansd Law as TRUE. Thus, lower courts violated the Constitution of the U.S; and, in so doing became traitors to their Art.6 oath/affirmation to uphold the Constitution as the Supreme Law of the land. As traitors, anything coming out of the lower courts is null and void as being issued by unregistered FOREIGN agents.

Furthermore, the OPPRESSIVE operation, force, and effect of the State Commercial and Business Code upon Federal Litigation and therefore upon an otherwise innocent, unwilling and unknowing VICTIM... without his Constitutional, etc. Rights being affirmed to him.. under the false premise that the Law Merchant is the Supreme Law of the Land, and the principles of laches and collateral estoppel, and the fraudulent laws that have developed therefrom...and which Appellant, Rt.Rev.Dr.Edward Wayland, Christian Minister, in his official capacity as Sovereign Citizen Sovereign Immunity has completely denied, disclaimed, declared, REVOKED. (Preamble.A.9,10, Declaration of Independence; Common Law--Christian!)

In any case NOT provided for by these statutes..the Law Merchant shall govern. U.C.C. 196

which is unconstitutional on its face and in its application. For, Appellant, Rt.Rev.Dr.Edward Wayland, declares that the U.S.Constitution is BINDING upon Appellee..and does not grant the powers to a servant to place his master in chains via "laws", "treaties", "code rules regulations". Res Judicata.

Nor can any "evidence" be presented against Appellant that he may have been deceived into assumptions on the basis that the signature of Rt.Rev.Dr.Edward Wayland, is under Common Law Copyright (18AmJur2d 9.1-10,130+,150+) and cannot be disclosed/published, etc. without his express permission/consent...which, of course has been denied to Appellee YEARS AGO!.

Appellant, Rt.Rev.Dr.Edward Wayland, has not waived and does NOT and will NOT waive knowingly nor purposefully nor intentionally nor otherwise his RIGHTS and IMMUNITIES and always has and does claim and invoke all rights and immunities and protections under the LAW, the Christian...not slithering semitic..LAW and the POSITIVE aspects (only) of the ancient and modern law merchant, and Constitutions as a body of law, per and under the Ancient English Kings' land grants of FREE AND COMMON SOCCAGE. (Blackstone; Pollock/Maitland).

Appellant claims that the highest virtue and order of the Law of Contract, negotiable instruments and taxation under International Law, U.S.Constitution, State Constitution is

Knowledge,

Agreement,

VOLUNTARINESS,

INTENT...with absence of mistake, fraud, duress, and like anomalies; and the Law Merchant and Common Law so state
Swanson v Fuline 248 F.Supp 364, etc.

However;

Appellee has ADMITTED to mistake...fraud..duress..coercion..

contempt-of-constitution..force..deceit..INTENT at reprisal (Amend.8) being illegal, unlawful, unconstitutional...OUTLAW.

Appellant has never voluntarily directly or indirectly, nor intentionally nor knowingly nor actually nor constructively submitted to nor acquiesced to the jurisdiction of the I.R.S. nor the negative aspects of the general or Federal Law Merchant nor other law nor Grant or franchise; nor state law nor contract; at the administrative level, nor at the Executive nor Legislative nor Judicial levels, nor any type of quasi-judicial level, nor at any other level nor in any other manner, and likewise with state and loval revenue and taxation authority.

Appellant has never knowingly nor otherwise intentionally submitted to nor acquiested in the above nor like express or implied jurisdictions and denies such Juriadictions; and which denials are Admitted, Admitted/Everred as TRUE by Appellee; and thus can NOT be disputed nor challenged nor denied.

Appellant has never, by overt acts, nor as a failure to perform duties or other acts, which can otherwise be held to be contructive or actual submission to or acquiescence in such jurisdictions, become subject to such jurisdictions, in that, inter alia, Appellant NEVER "slept on his rights'; thus the law must protect this vigilant Appellant.

Appellee, therefore and otherwise, is NOT subject to the jurisdiction of Appellee' I.R.S.(which, though defended by the government has NEVER established to being a branch-of-government, a quasi-branch, a den of unregistered foreign-agents, or what) at any level by any means, for under the Law Merchant, Common Law, Theological Law, Constitution, and the law general and otherwise, Appellant has never knowingly nor voluntarily nor intentionally submitted to or otherwise became the OBJECT of or SUBJECT to the jurisdiction of the Congress, the I.R.S. or State Taxing Authority in any manner related to or authorizing Federal taxes, nor has Appellant acquiesced therein actually or constructively, and Appellant puts the Appellee to the PROOF of jurisdiction on the merits of jurisdictional fact for the actions taken by Appellee wherein Appellant has Disclaimed and Denied all such jurisdiction/authority.

No actual or implied Contractual nor grant-type relationship exists between Appellant and any state, local, or Federal government under any body of law NOT excluding the Law Merchant. Therefore, there is NO civil jurisdiction of Appellee over Appellant
Hale v Henkel 201 US 43
and Appellant puts the Appellee to substantive and material and positive and affirmative PROOF of the jurisdictions claimed, and the actions taken against Appellant and the Christian CHURCH, and invoked on their part whether impliedly, expressly, actually, directly, or indirectly invoked or implied, assumed (dreamed-of) by Appellee.

I.R.S. Form 1040..claimed to be Negotiable Instrument(?)

The I.R.S. form 1040 (ALL OF WHICH HAVEBEEN REVOKED BY APPELLANT) appears to be an INSTRUMENT in the nature of a Negotiable Instrument (by stretching the N.I. to/beyond the breaking point of credibility)

nevertheless, it is an instrument which, under the Federal Law Merchant now or yet to be "fashirned", discharges the duty/obligation to file a return/or in part provide information, which duty/obligation can arise only out of a

FRANCHISE-

which franchise Appellant is NOT the beneficiary or, nor object of---in any way.

Appellant, Rt.Rev.Dr.Edward Wayland, Christian Minister remains and retains Sovereign Citizen Sovereign Immunity: FREE MAN.

Appellant is, therefore, NOT the OBJECT of nor SUBJECT to the Amend.16, Art. 1 U.S. Constitution taxing power, nor any portion of Title 26 U.S.C....which is "code"...not statute, etc., for hé is NOT a "voluntary" (U.S. v Flora 362 US 145) participant in nor beneficiary of any FRANCHISE which may operate to require Appellant to file a return or provide information; and is thusly NOT required to file a return or provide information. Nor can Appellant be made to become an involuntary party to such an instrument absent some in personam jurisdiction over him and SUBJECT MATTER and proof thereof, thus he is not a "mutual" party as required by law express and implied in the class of cases represented by Swanson. The Appellee' I.R.S. has repeatedly refused to give a legal description of the 1040 form and its operation under the Federal Law Merchant and Federal Common Law.

In fact, not only is Appellant NOT recipient of any "grant" from government, but the government has refused to pay legitimate JURY verdict, which, under I.R.S. mathematics now amounts to more than 12,774,000 dollars; has admitted to stealing an estimated 50,000 from Appellant's P.O.box; and bhat the Social Secubity Adm. has admitted to owing Appellant in excess of 2,500,000 dollars by I.R.S. math. Which Appellant is, of course being swindled out of.

Deadbeat Appellant'I.R.S.

Social Security "franchise"(?)

Appellant is NOT a "voluntary" (U.S. v Flora) participant in nor beneficiary of the "social security" franchises; and is therefpr NOT a person in the nature of a "ward of the state"kwhich owes (Appellant does NOT OWE..see above) a debt/obligation to the "state and has stated and otherwise Published the same to the world (in rem) and has taken action against the S.S.A. in the courts, establishing involuntary and coercion, and all individuals (in personam) And has labeled theSS.A. as Deadbeat.

Appellant only by mistake of jurisdictional fact has appeared to become a voluntary party to such programs..and never would have so appeared to or actually become such a party hereto or use the number if he had been in full possession of the pertinent facts, and Appellant was in fact--NOT in full possession of nor knowledgeable of the said facts; and in fact, was misled, cajoled, unduly influenced, forced, coerced, DEFRAUDED, misrepresented to and otherwise unlawfully kept from full knowledge of said Facts as to the Social Security Franchise and license etc. really was, is, and may

become and the same as to effect of said Facts was misrepresented to Appellant by those in position to influence Appellant directly and indirectly.

Furthermore, Appellant, Rt.Rev.Dr.Edward Wayland, when cognizant of the adverse effects brought Federal Suit for relief from the S.S.A.; and then later charged that the S.S.A., in combination with the I.R.S. has conspired against his CHRISTIAN Rights to deceive him into accepting the Mark of the Beast:

6 area code 6 social security number 6

Thus, there is total absence of ADMINISTRATIVE (primary) jurisdiction of Appellee' I.R.S. over the person, property, interests, and endeavors of Appellant, Appellant NOT being object of the Tax Law involved--there being, therefor NO subject matter and NO cause upon which the Appellee I.R.S. can base a claim and sustain such or other Jurisdiction in a court for enforcement of its demands upon Appellant, nor upon Christian CHURCH, nor right to look into his personal affairs directly or indirectly under Title 26 "code".

I.R.S. "W-4" forms

Appellant, if he ever worked for a Corporation or enfranchised person or quasi-corporate entity or for any other reason ever filled out or filed or ohherwise became or was made party to an IRS W-4 form or 1040 form, it was by mistake of Jurisdictional Fact, and the same are hereby declared to be VOID and of no effect by mistake-of-Jurisdictional Fact (26 U.S.C. 3402(p)). Under 3402(p) it is affirmed that the said W-4 form is a VOLUNTARY request for withholding. reaffirmed by various I.R.S. Regulations (31.3402(p)1(b)(1).; and being involuntarily extracted under force and duress, direct and implied, is, or course null and void as violation of Constitutional Rights; and is thus unconstitutional on its face and in its application. This, Appellee I.R.S. has ADMITTED is TRUE. res judicata.

And, Appellee I.R.S. being the deceitful promoter of the number of the Beast (revelation): 666, Christians are prohibited from honoring or obeying that which is of-satan. This is PRIME Common Law...Christian Common Law!

Thus is is established and Admitted as TRUE by Appellee that there is NO franchise; the S.S.number is not valid; the W-4 form is legally void.

Thus, Appellee had no jurisdiction/authority to place any restraints of any kind upon Appellant, Christian CHURCH, etc.

Title 5 U.S.C.

Insofar as Title 5 U.S.C. and related CFR rules do NOT admit jurisdiction of the Administrative agency of the Treasury and I.R.S. (5 U.S.C. 101), or other administrative agency that may be involved in this or related Federal Tax issues or that claim jurisdiction, Appellant, Rt.Rev.Dr.Edward Wayland, Sovereign Citizen Sovereign Immunity, relies on law express and implied in and under Title 5 U.S.C. wherein such agencies are the OBJECT OF and therefore SUBJECT TO 5 U.S.C. pleading (5 USC 101)

This Instrument is to be construed as a DEMAND at Law, the words and phrases "petition", "pleading" and the like being merely descriptive form; and is filed under the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, and 5 U.S.C. 555(e), and challenges jurisdiction as contemplated by or in the nature of that contemplated by 5 U.S.C. 554(b)(2), 558(b)(3), 706(2)(c), in aid of the administrative process and I.R.S. to provide a proper foundation and RECORD for Judicial Review under 5 U.S.C. 701-706 and other law.

Appellant has demanded proof on the record of JURISDICTIONAL FACTS and challenges and denies right or discretion of I.R.S. Administrative officers and courts on judicial review to "administratively" or "judicially" NOTICE the denied and complained-of jurisdiction to exist, and to the contrary has demanded substantive and material proof thereof on the record.

Appellee' I.R.S. has repeatedly FAILED TO PROVE.

Appellant, Rt.Rev.Dr.Edward Wayland, Christian Minister, prefers NOT to plead under provisions of I.R.S. self-serving rules and regulations and 26 CFR (Code Federal Regulations) in that it appears that this would be clear admission of I.R.S.(etal) jurisdiction (which Appellant has repeatedly DECLARED to be non-existant/and which Appellee has Admitted/Averred is TRUE). Thus, Exhaustion (at Administrative levels) is not necessary where pure law or Jurisdiction are questions.

5 U.S.C. 702, 706 & citations
Hood v USPB 511 P2d 52
Reggles v Simpson 434 P2d 559
etc. res judicata.

Where such a demand, declaration, decision, or assumption is evident, the Appellee' I.R.S. is required to provide, if any, contrary authority of a material and substantive nature with specific citations. This Appellee has NOT done. Why? Very simple. There is NO jurisdiction/authority for usurpation/tyranny.

Jury Trial

Where Appellee has FAILED to PROVE, failed to establish jurisdiction/authority, the Constitution of the U.S. applies, and not of the numerous hidden, secret, treaties, laws, etc.etc.etc. which Appellant, Rt.Rev.Dr.Edward Wayland, as Sovereign Citizen has DISCLAIMED.

Thus, Amendment 1 RIGHT to petition for Redress of Grievance from oppressive government practices is the Supreme Law.

Thus, Art.3, Amend.6,7 RIGHT to JURY TRIAL is the Supreme Law.

Thus, all Proceedural Safeguards of Common Law Publid-Wrong apply; with Burden-of-Proof REMAINING UPON APPELLEE' I.R.S.

DENIAL by Appellee' I.R.S., lower courts, etc. is Violation off Constitutional Rights.

THUS: Appellee I.R.S. has failed to prove jurisdiction; has acted without authority, in FELONY, ANARCHY, OUTLAW.

This, of course, constitutes breach-of-contract, -covenant, -faith, and thus releases other party from any further obligation,

direct, alleged, implied, assumed.

An example of such denial of Justice, thereby Breach-of-Contract.

"The Court today entered the following order in the above entitled case:
The appeal is dismissed for want of jurisdiction, Treating the papers whereon the appeal was taken as a petition for writ of certiorari, certiorari si denied."

In stating the court had NO jurisdiction, the court bluntly stated that as a Judiciary Branch of Government it spoke for the other branches of government, quasi-branches, etc., and has thus established that NONE of them thereby had any jurisdiction. In so stating, the court has given back the right to redress his own grievances, himself. This is affirmed in Scripture, as well.

Thus, the court, in Anarchy (Brandeis: Olmstead v U.S.) is creating Anarchy...for what the court has stated is that the Constitution of the United States, under which the Appeal was made is NOT jurisdictional, is not valid, binding law, and is thus null and void.

Amendment 16, being thereby part of that non-valid Constitution is thereby totally null and void.

WHEREFORE

This court must redress Amend.1, et c. Grievance, or be declared OUTLAW.

Rt Rev Dr Edward Wayland pastor pro se forma pauperis
Sovereign Citizen; Preamble. A. 9,10
Sovereign Immunity; " " " "
Former scientist Manhattan Project
Affidavit//Theological Judgment

RT. REV. EDWARD WAYLAND
P. O. BOX 283
HAVERHILL, MA 01830

Certificate of Service

This is to certify that service of the foregoing SUPPLEMENT ADDITION SUMMARY has been made this 15th day of Octo 1982 upon Appellee by depositing a copy thereof in the United States mail postage prepaid addressed to

U.S. Atty Gen.
Dept Justice
Washington DC 20530

Rt Rev Dr Edward Wayland pastor pro se forma pauperis

RT. REV. EDWARD WAYLAND
P. O. BOX 283
HAVERHILL, MA 01830